UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/24112
17 June 1992
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

LETTER DATED 17 JUNE 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF AZERBAIJAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Circumstances oblige me to turn to you.

I should like to draw your attention to the fact that in statements circulated in the United Nations by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Government of Armenia and dated 12 and 13 June 1992 respectively, the Republic of Armenia revealed what had hitherto been its constantly concealed involvement in the warfare, and openly announced its intention to enter into direct military conflict with the Azerbaijani Republic.

Thus the large-scale regional war of which we have repeatedly warned is becoming reality.

In the government document, Armenia declares its commitment to peaceful means of settling conflicts, even as it clings to the part of the territory of Azerbaijan that was captured by force of arms. Hypocritically it is appealing to the world community to stop what is purported to be the "aggression" being planned by Azerbaijan with the aim of dragging Armenia into a direct military conflict. It is attempting to transfer responsibility for the conflict to the Government of Azerbaijan.

Specifically, the statements by the Government of Armenia allege that military action against Armenia is being planned by Azerbaijan.

What military action by Azerbaijan against Armenia can they be talking about at a time when a part of the territory of Azerbaijan itself has been occupied by Armenia?

It seems to me that it has long been clear to the world community which of the two parties to the conflict has claims on the territory of the other. Azerbaijan has not had and does not have any territorial claims on the neighbouring Republic. All of Azerbaijan's efforts within the framework of international organizations have been directed to a single goal: liberating the territories of the Azerbaijani Republic that are under Armenian occupation so as to guarantee peaceful coexistence between the two neighbouring States.

As for the allegations about Azerbaijan's intentions to drag Armenia into a direct military conflict, allow me to state first of all that inasmuch as Azerbaijan has no territorial claims on any entity whatsoever, it did not and does not intend to drag any State whatsoever into a military confrontation.

Secondly, how can there be any question of dragging Armenia into a conflict, when that Republic has been waging war in the territory of Azerbaijan from the very moment when the issue of Nagorny Karabakh arose? Can anyone seriously believe that, on their own, the Armenians in Nagorny Karabakh, numbering just over 100,000, were able to capture the whole of the region and the surrounding border area, were able to expel more than 200,000 Azerbaijanis and were able to carve out a corridor connecting Nagorny Karabakh to Armenia, without having (as that Republic's propaganda would have us believe) weapons, ammunition or rations? It would be naive to think that Azerbaijan would not have solved its internal problems peacefully, had it not been for direct military intervention by Armenia.

Having long since unleashed war on the territory of Azerbaijan under the pretext of a national movement to liberate Armenians in Nagorny Karabakh, having sent in its armed units, and having fully occupied all of Nagorny Karabakh and the adjacent regions, the Republic of Armenia is using the aforementioned statements to prepare the justification for further warfare against Azerbaijan, without regard for appearances, with the aim of annexing the territory of another State - an aim that is obvious to all sensible people.

The true goal of those statements is for the Armenian leadership, taking advantage of the lack of objective information from independent sources concerning the real state of affairs in Nagorny Karabakh and on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan, to divert public attention from the question of the occupation of Azerbaijani territory, and to justify a further escalation of military action against Azerbaijan.

Unable to conceal any further its active role in the warfare, Armenia is obliged to disavow its involvement in events in the region. While making thorough preparations for further aggression, the Republic of Armenia is resorting to propaganda tactics with a view to justifying the planned activities that are to follow its statements, and in order to sow confusion among the members of the United Nations Security Council before the question is discussed in that forum.

The only way to stop further escalation of the conflict is to reveal to the world community the truth about the war. One specific step in that direction would be the full publication of the report on the mission undertaken by F. Vendrell, which we have already requested, and publication of all the information from independent sources.

It should be noted that the capture by Armenia of further inhabited locations in Azerbaijani territory always coincides with the holding of peace negotiations between Armenia and Azerbaijan with the participation of third parties. For example, the town of Shushy was treacherously captured by

Armenia behind the backs of participants in the tripartite negotiations in Tehran. Every time, Armenia has sought to justify its acts of aggression either by claiming that it was necessary to open up "humanitarian" corridors or that it was necessary "to eradicate hot spots" in towns inhabited by peaceful people.

Armenia's plans are becoming clear. On the eve of the scheduled discussion of the question of Nagorny Karabakh by the Security Council, Armenia refers in the aforementioned statements to a concentration of forces supposedly taking place in inhabited locations in the Ordubad and Zangelan regions of Azerbaijan, and in the town of Agdam. The Armenian armed forces are preparing to destroy those inhabited locations under the pretext of eradicating hot spots.

By attacking border regions of Azerbaijan, Armenia is seeking to create around its frontiers a "scorched territory" without Azerbaijani inhabitants.

I therefore again appeal to you, as Secretary-General of an Organization whose task is to maintain peace, to take immediate action to avert further aggression against my State, further expansion of Armenian territory at the expense of Azerbaijan, and further expanses of no-man's land.

I should be grateful if this letter could be circulated as an official document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Hassan A. HASSANOV
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/24113
17 June 1992
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/FRENCH

NOTE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Following consultations of the Security Council held on 17 June 1992, the President of the Council issued the following statement on behalf of the members of the Council in connection with the item entitled "The situation between Iraq and Kuwait":

"The members of the Security Council have noted the letter of 17 April 1992 from the Chairman of the Iraq-Kuwait Boundary Demarcation Commission to the Secretary-General and express their complete support for the work of the Secretary-General and the Boundary Demarcation Commission in implementing paragraph 3 of resolution 687 (1991). They recall in this connection that through the demarcation process the Boundary Demarcation Commission is not reallocating territory between Kuwait and Iraq, but is simply carrying out the technical task necessary to demarcate the precise coordinates of the boundary between Kuwait and Iraq for the first time. This task is being carried out in the special circumstances following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and pursuant to resolution 687 and the Secretary-General's report (S/22558) for implementing paragraph 3 of that resolution. They look forward to the completion of the work of the Commission.

"The members of the Council have noted with particular concern the letter of 21 May 1992 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq to the Secretary-General (S/24044) concerning the work of the Boundary Demarcation Commission, which appears to call into question Iraq's adherence to Security Council resolution 687 (1991). The members of the Council are concerned in particular that the letter from Iraq of 21 May 1992 may be interpreted as rejecting the finality of the Boundary Demarcation Commission's decisions notwithstanding the terms of resolution 687 and the Secretary-General's report for implementing paragraph 3 of that resolution, both of which were formally accepted by Iraq.

"They note with dismay that the letter recalls past Iraqi claims to Kuwait without also recalling Iraq's subsequent repudiations of these claims, inter alia through its acceptance of resolution 687 (1991). The

members of the Council firmly reject any suggestion that tends to dispute the very existence of Kuwait, a member State of the United Nations.

"The members of the Council remind Iraq of its obligations under resolution 687 (1991), and in particular paragraph 2 thereof, and under other relevant resolutions of the Council.

"The members of the Council also remind Iraq of its acceptance of the resolutions of the Council adopted pursuant to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, which forms the basis for the cease-fire. The members of the Council wish to stress to Iraq the inviolability of the international boundary between Iraq and Kuwait being demarcated by the Commission and guaranteed by the Council pursuant to resolution 687 (1991), and the grave consequences that would ensue from any breach thereof."